

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1 through 14 are pending and have been examined. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Keskitalo in view of Gordon. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection.

It is axiomatic that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to these claims, the Office Action must show that the combination of Keskitalo and Gordon discloses or suggests each and every limitation of the rejected claims.

Claims 1 and 10, which are independent claims, each requires an array antenna having M antenna elements on *each side* of a polygon having K sides. Claims 3-5 and 12-13 also include this limitation, by virtue of their dependence on claims 1 and 10 respectively.

The Office Action readily admits that Keskitalo does not disclose the arrangement of the antennas, and cites Gordon as curing this deficiency. However, Gordon does not disclose or suggest that the antenna elements of an array antenna are arranged on each side of a polygon having K sides. Rather, in Gordon, the antenna elements are disposed on the vertices of a polygon having N sides.

As a result, the combination of Keskitalo and Gordon fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10, 12, and 13. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 14 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. The Office Action notes, however, that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for so noting, but respectfully defer rewriting these claims until after the Examiner has had the opportunity to consider the Applicants' request for reconsideration of the outstanding rejection, as set forth above.

The Office Action also objects to the IDS filed by the Applicants on October 30, 2002. Specifically, the Office Action notes that although the IDS indicated a Japanese Office Action issued on April 9, 2002, that a copy of this office action was not included in the IDS. Applicants' records indicate that this reference was previously submitted. A copy of the IDS and the Japanese Office Action will be included herewith for the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: June 17, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs